UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------------|------------------------------|----------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/589,895 01/23/2007 | | Yoshiyuki Sasaki | R2184.0527/P527 | 2816 |
| 24998 DICKSTEIN SI | 7590 04/27/200 HAPIRO LLP | EXAMINER | | |
| 1825 EYE STR | EET NW | GIESY, ADAM | | |
| Washington, Do | 20000-3403 | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| | | | 2627 | |
| | | | | |
| | | | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE |
| | | | 04/27/2009 | PAPER |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

| Application No. | Applicant(s) | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|--|--|
| 10/589,895 | SASAKI, YOSHIYUKI | | |
| | | | |
| Examiner | Art Unit | | |

| | ADAM R. GIESY | 2627 | |
|--|--|---|--|
| The MAILING DATE of this communication appear | ars on the cover sheet with the o | correspondence add | ress |
| THE REPLY FILED <u>07 April 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPI | ICATION IN CONDITION FOR A | LLOWANCE. | |
| 1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appe for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods: | eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavi al (with appeal fee) in compliance | t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or | hich places the (3) a Request |
| a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Ac no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f) | lvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth ter than SIX MONTHS from the mailing b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE | g date of the final rejectio | n. |
| Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extender 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sloset forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL | ension and the corresponding amount nortened statutory period for reply origi | of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic | ate extension fee e action; or (2) as |
| The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS | sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to | avoid dismissal of the | |
| 3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, be (a) They raise new issues that would require further con (b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below | sideration and/or search (see NO ⁻ v); | ΓE below); | |
| (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or (d) ☐ They present additional claims without canceling a c | | | ne issues for |
| NOTE: <u>See Continuation Sheet</u> . (See 37 CFR 1.11 | | | |
| 4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12 | * ** | mpliant Amendment (I | PTOL-324). |
| 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): | | | |
| 6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be allow non-allowable claim(s). | · | • | _ |
| 7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prove The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: 1-19 and 21-34. Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: | | I be entered and an ex | cplanation of |
| AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE | | | |
| The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). | | | |
| 9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to over showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary | ercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea | al and/or appellant fails | s to provide a |
| 10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER | of the status of the claims after el | ntry is below or attache | ed. |
| 11. The request for reconsideration has been considered but | does NOT place the application in | condition for allowand | ce because: |
| 12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (l 13. ☐ Other: See Continuation Sheet. | PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s) | | |
| /Wayne Young/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2627 | /Adam R. Giesy/ Examiner, Art Unit 2627 | | |
| | | | |

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Newly amended claims raise new issues that would change the scope of the invention previously claimed and prosecuted and would require further consideration and search..

Continuation of 13. Other: Examiner has considered the arguments posed by Applicant. Examiner asserts that the new claim language adds limitations to the claim that would change the scope of the claims and would require further search.

Furthermore, in response to Applicant's Arguments that Ito does manage the "AV data in File-A", Examiner respocctfully disagrees. Examiner notes that this is a piecemeal analysis of the Ito reference. Examiner notes that Ito clearly describes real-time recording and skipping fo the defective area during the recording of AV data (see column 12, lines 26-40). Examiner also notes that Applicant admits that no defect management is performed when AV data is recording in the Background Art section (see instant specification, page 3, line 21 thru page 4, line 1)

Applicant's other areguments all seem to be the same as those recited with regard to the limitation from previously prosecuted claim 3. For at least the reasons discussed above, Examiner asserts that the proposed claim amendments do not place the application in condition for allowance and they require further search. Therefore, the proposed claim amendments are not entered.